



8th October 2018

Strictly Private & Confidential

Professor David Latchman



Dear Professor Latchman,

Re: Disciplinary Hearing under Statute 18 of UCL's Charter and Statutes

I am writing to confirm the outcome of the disciplinary hearing you attended on Friday, 7 September 2018 at 9.30am. The meeting was held in the UCL HR Department, 2nd Floor Bidborough House, 38-50 Bidborough Street, London WC1H 9BT.

I chaired the meeting and was supported by Donna Dalrymple (Head of HR, School of Life & Medical Sciences) who provided HR advice. The management case was presented by Professor Ros Smyth (Institute Director, UCL Institute of Child Health) and Jennifer Asebi-Antwi took the notes of the meeting.

You attended the meeting unaccompanied, but you were aware that you could be accompanied by a trade union representative or work colleague if you so wished. We heard evidence from your witnesses: Professor Tony Segal and Dr Shanie Budhrun-Mahadeo who attended in person; Dr Mattia Calissano and Professor Paul Townsend who participated by telephone.

This disciplinary hearing was conducted in accordance with UCL's Procedure for Disciplinary Hearings, which can be found at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/human-resources/sites/human-resources/files/disciplinary-appendix-c-procedure-for-disciplinary-hearing.pdf>. The options for possible formal outcomes available to me were as detailed in UCL's Statute 18, Part III, a copy of which can be found at: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/srs/governance-and-committees/governance/documents/charter-and-statutes>.

The purpose of the hearing was to consider the alleged misconduct that:

- Your failure to manage the laboratory appropriately, together with your involvement as senior author or co-author on the publications where misconduct was identified, amounted to recklessness in the conduct of an aspect of a research project, which facilitated the misconduct research identified in the following investigations:
 1. Investigation into research misconduct in respect of 32 papers published between 1990 and 2013 by researchers based at the UCL Institute of Child Health;
 2. Investigation into research misconduct in respect of seven papers published by researchers based at the UCL Institute of Child Health between 2002 and 2008


After reading all the evidence, hearing the UCL case and your response, and considering the witness evidence, my decision is that no formal disciplinary action should be taken.

There are also a number of recommendations that I would like to make arising out of the evidence that was presented:

- 1) Consideration by UCL should be given to difficulties in leading a research unit, when the PI can only spend a relatively small proportion of his/her time supervising and monitoring the research. Although I have not found that the management of your research programme was inadequate, nevertheless I recommend that careful consideration be given to the problems which may arise when PIs of large complex research programmes have additional demanding commitments.
- 2) Senior group leaders should give careful consideration as to when they cease to be co-authors of publications when the management of the research in question has largely passed to former group members who are now independent.
- 3) More generally, there is a need for the scientific community to recognise that scientific fraud may be difficult to detect, even in well run teams; and there is a clear need in the training of early career scientists to inculcate the highest standards of research ethics, while making clear the consequences of fraudulent behaviour.
- 4) I propose that these general recommendations be considered by the Vice-provost Research.

As no formal action is being taken, this now brings a close to this disciplinary process.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard Catlow". The script is cursive and fluid, with the first letters of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Professor Richard Catlow, FRS
UCL Chemistry

Cc: Professor Ros Smyth